arXiv:1704.07349v1 [stat.AP] 24 Apr 2017

A Non-Gaussian, Nonparametric Structure for Gene-Gene and Gene-Environment Interactions in Case-Control Studies Based on Hierarchies of Dirichlet Processes

Durba Bhattacharya and Sourabh Bhattacharya[1]

[1]Durba Bhattacharya is an Assistant Professor in St. Xavier's College, Kolkata, pursuing PhD in Interdisciplinary Statistical Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Sourabh Bhattacharya is an Associate Professor in Interdisciplinary Statistical Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Corresponding e-mail: sourabh@isical.ac.in.

Abstract

It is becoming increasingly clear that complex interactions among genes and environmental factors play crucial roles in triggering complex diseases. Thus, understanding such interactions is vital, which is possible only through statistical models that adequately account for such intricate, albeit unknown, dependence structures.

Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) attempt such modeling, relating finite mixtures composed of Dirichlet processes that represent unknown number of genetic sub-populations through a hierarchical matrix-normal structure that incorporates gene-gene interactions, and possible mutations, induced by environmental variables. However, the product dependence structure implied by their matrix-normal model seems to be too simple to be appropriate for general complex, realistic situations.

In this article, we propose and develop a novel nonparametric Bayesian model for case-control genotype data using hierarchies of Dirichlet processes that offers a more realistic and nonparametric dependence structure between the genes, induced by the environmental variables. In this regard, we propose a novel and highly parallelisable MCMC algorithm that is rendered quite efficient by the combination of modern parallel computing technology, effective Gibbs sampling steps, retrospective sampling and Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TMCMC). We use appropriate Bayesian hypothesis testing procedures to detect the roles of genes and environment in case-control studies.

We apply our ideas to 5 biologically realistic case-control genotype datasets simulated under distinct set-ups, and obtain encouraging results in each case. We finally apply our ideas to a real, myocardial infarction dataset, and obtain interesting results on gene-gene and gene-environment interaction, while broadly agreeing with the results reported in the literature.

Keywords: *Case-control study; Hierarchical Dirichlet process; Gene-gene and gene-environment interaction; Myocardial Infarction; Parallel processing; Transformation based MCMC.*

Contents

1 Introduction **4**

2 A new Bayesian nonparametric model for gene-gene and gene-environment interactions **6**

2.1 **Case-control genotype data** 6

2.2 **Mixture models based on Dirichlet processes** 6

2.3 **Hierarchical Dirichlet processes to introduce dependence between the genes and case-control status** 8

2.4 **The Chinese restaurant analogy** 9

3 Discussion of the dependence structure induced by our HDP-based model **10**

3.1 **Dependence among individuals** 10

3.2 **Dependence among the genes** 10

3.3 **Case-control dependence** 11

4 An MCMC method using Gibbs sampling and TMCMC **12**

4.1 **Full conditionals** 12

4.1.1 **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{H}_k$** 12

4.1.2 **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$** 12

4.1.3 **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$** 13

4.2 **Retrospective method for simulating from $\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right]$** 14

4.2.1 **Retrospective method to draw from $\left[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}\right]$** 14

4.2.2 **Retrospective method for estimating C_{ijk} arbitrarily accurately** 15

4.2.3 **Retrospective method to simulate from $\frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k+\sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k}+n_{\cdot jk}}$** 15

4.3 **Updating procedure of z_{ijk} and $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$** 16

4.4 **Updating the missing data $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}$** 17

4.5 **Updating μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$ using TMCMC** 17

4.5.1 **Relevant factors for updating μ_G and β_G** . . . 17
4.5.2 **Relevant factors for updating μ_{G_0} and β_{G_0}** . . . 17
4.5.3 **Relevant factors for updating μ_H and β_H** . . . 18
4.5.4 **Mixture of additive and multiplicative TMCMC for updating μ_G, β_G, μ_{G_0}, β_{G_0}, μ_H and β_H in a single block** . . . 18

5 A parallel algorithm for implementing our MCMC procedure 18

6 Detection of the roles of environment, genes and their interactions with respect to our HDP based model 20

6.1 **Formulation of the tests and interpretation of their results** . . . 20
6.1.1 **Bayesian test for the impact of the genes on case-control** . . . 20
6.1.2 **Bayesian test for the significance of the environmental variables** . . . 21
6.1.3 **Bayesian test for significance of gene-gene interaction** . . . 21
6.1.4 **Interpretations of the results of the above tests** . . . 22
6.2 **Methodologies for implementing the Bayesian tests** . . . 23
6.2.1 **Hypothesis testing based on clustering modes** . . . 23
6.2.2 **Enhancement of clustering metric based inference using Euclidean distance** . . . 24
6.2.3 **Formal Bayesian hypothesis testing procedure integrating the above developments** . . . 24
6.2.4 **Null model and choice of ε** . . . 25

7 Simulation studies 26

7.1 **First simulation study: presence of gene-gene and gene-environment interaction** 26
7.1.1 **Data description** . . . 26
7.1.2 **Model implementation** . . . 27
7.1.3 **Specifications of the thresholds ε's using null distributions** . . . 27
7.1.4 **Results of fitting our model** . . . 27

7.1.5 **Detection of DPL** 28
7.2 **Second simulation study: no genetic or environmental effect** 32
7.3 **Third simulation study: absence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but presence of environmental effect** 33
7.4 **Fourth simulation study: presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect** 33
7.5 **Fifth simulation study: independent and additive genetic and environmental effects** 34

8 Application of our HDP based ideas to a real, case-control dataset on Myocardial Infarction **38**
8.1 **Data description** 39
8.2 **Remarks on model implementation** 40
8.3 **Results of the real data analysis** 40
8.3.1 **Effect of the sex variable** 40
8.3.2 **Roles of individual genes** 40
8.3.3 **Gene-gene interactions** 42
8.3.4 **Posteriors of the number of sub-populations** 48

9 Summary and conclusion **48**

1. INTRODUCTION

In spite of much research on gene-gene interaction, including genome-wide association studies (GWAS), it has become increasingly clear that gene-gene interaction alone is insufficient for explaining most complex diseases. Accounting for relevant environmental factors in the study independently of the genetic factors is not sufficient either – biomedical research points towards the importance of interactions between genes and the environment in explaining complex diseases. Indeed, according to Hunter (2005) (see aso Mather & Caligary (1976)), considering only the separate contributions of genes and environment to a disease, ignoring their interactions, will lead to incorrect estimation of the disease proportion (the "population attributable fraction") that is explained by genes, the environment, and their joint effect. In particular, environmental exposures are expected to influence gene-gene interactions of the individuals. A comprehensive overview of gene-environment interaction with various examples is provided in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*).

Since no simple relationship exists between gene and environment, it is clear that linear or additive models, as are mostly used so far, are inadequate for modeling gene-environment interactions. Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) proposed a Bayesian semiparametric model that uses finite mixtures using Dirichlet processes to represent the subject-wise genotype data. A hierarchical matrix-normal distribution connecting the mixtures encapsulates the mechanism of induction of dependence among the genes by the environment. Additionally, the mixtures have the provision for mutation such that the phenomenon does not affect gene-gene interactions.

We now elaborate on a possible drawback of the dependence structure induced by the modeling strategy of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). In their model, the relevant gene-gene covariance matrix for individual i is $\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}\boldsymbol{A}$, where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is the gene-gene interaction matrix common to all the individuals in the absence of environmental variables, and $\tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = \sigma_{ii} + \phi$, with σ_{ii} being the i-th diagonal element of a symmetric, positive definite matrix not associated with the environmental variable, and ϕ is a non-negative parameter, to be interpreted as the effect of the environmental variable $\boldsymbol{E}$ on gene-gene interaction. Note that it is more appropriate to replace ϕ with ϕ_i to re-

flect the effect of the i-th value $\boldsymbol{E}_i$ on gene-gene interaction, but this would make the marginal distribution of the genotype dependent on $\boldsymbol{E}_i$, which is not desirable biologically, except in the rare mutational case. Moreover, from the biological perspective, $\boldsymbol{E}_i$ can affect only gene-gene interactions, not the marginal genetic effect: with ϕ_i replacing ϕ, $\tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = \sigma_{ii} + \phi_i$, so that even the marginal variances are influenced. To avoid these issues, Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) assumed that the covariance matrices for all the individuals are affected in the same way by the environmental variable, which seems to be a limitation of the covariance structure. Observe that, since σ_{ii} may differ subject-wise, the marginal distribution of the genotype of the i-th individual does depend upon i, but as noted in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), this realistically considers the issue that the subjects represent further sub-divisions of a given sub-population, and these sub-divisions may correspond to slightly different genotypic distributions. In fact, σ_{ii} may encapsulate a negligible effect of $\boldsymbol{E}_i$.

In this article, we introduce a novel Bayesian nonparametric model for gene-gene and gene-environment interactions for case-control genotype data that solves the issues detailed above. Our model represents the individual genotype data as finite mixtures based on Dirichlet processes as before, but instead of the hierarchical matrix normal distribution, we introduce a hierarchy of Dirichlet processes that create appropriate nonparametric dependence among the genes induced by the environment, case-control dependence, and dependence among the individuals. As we show, our modeling strategy satisfies all the desirable properties, bypassing the drawbacks of the matrix-normal based model of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). Although our hierarchical Dirichlet process (HDP) model has parallels with the HDP introduced by Teh, Jordan, Beal & Blei (2006), our HDP has a level of hierarchy more compared to Teh et al. (2006). Moreover, we develop a novel and highly parallelisable Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methodology that combines the efficiencies of modern parallel computing infrastructure, Gibbs steps, retrospective sampling methods, and Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TMCMC). For the hypothesis testing procedures, we essentially adopt and extend the ideas provided in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). Application of our model and methods to five simulation experiments for the validation purpose yielded quite encouraging results, and application to a real myocardial

infarction (MI) dataset yielded results that are broadly in agreement with the results reported in the literature, but provided new and interesting insights into the mechanisms of gene-gene and gene-environment interactions.

The rest of our paper is structured as follows. We introduce our Bayesian nonparametric gene-gene and gene-environment interaction model in Section 2, and in Section 3 discuss the relevant dependence structures induced by our model. In Section 4 we propose an MCMC methodology for fitting our model, and in Section 5 we propose a parallel algorithm for implementing the proposed MCMC method. In Section 6 we extend the Bayesian hypothesis testing procedures proposed in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) to learn about the roles of genes, environmental variables and their interactions in case-control studies. In Section 7 we apply the developments to five biologically realistic simulated data sets associated with five different set-ups, and obtain encouraging results, thereby validating our model and methods. In Section 8 we analyze the real MI dataset using our ideas, demonstrating quite interesting and insightful outcome. Finally, we summarize our work with concluding remarks in Section 9.

2. A NEW BAYESIAN NONPARAMETRIC MODEL FOR GENE-GENE AND GENE-ENVIRONMENT INTERACTIONS

2.1 Case-control genotype data

For $s = 1, 2$ denoting the two chromosomes, let $y^s_{ijkr} = 1$ and $y^s_{ijkr} = 0$ indicate the presence and absence of the minor allele of the i-th individual, j-th gene, r-th locus, and the k-th group (either control or case), for $k = 0, 1$, with $k = 1$ denoting case; $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$; $r = 1, \ldots, L_j$ and $j = 1, \ldots, J$; let $N = N_1 + N_2$. Let $\boldsymbol{E}_i$ denote a set of environmental variables associated with the i-th individual. In what follows, we model this case-control genotype and the environmental data using our Bayesian semiparametric model, described in the next few sections.

2.2 Mixture models based on Dirichlet processes

Let $\boldsymbol{y}_{ijkr} = (y^1_{ijkr}, y^2_{ijkr})$, and if $L = \max\{L_1, \ldots, L_J\}$, let $\boldsymbol{Y}_{ijk} = (\boldsymbol{y}_{ijk1}, \boldsymbol{y}_{ijk2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{ijkL_j})$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk} = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{ijk,L_j+1}, \ldots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{ijkL})$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}$ are unobserved and assumed to be missing. We intro-

duce these unobserved variables to match the number of loci for all the genes, which is required so that the vectors of minor allele frequencies come from the distribution having the same dimension. This "dimension-matching" is required for the theoretical development of our modeling ideas; see (2.5) and (2.6).

We assume that for every triplet (i, j, k), $\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk} = (\mathbf{x}_{ijk1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{ijkL)} = (\boldsymbol{Y}_{ijk}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk})$ have the mixture distribution

$$[\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}] = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_{mijk} \prod_{r=1}^{L} f\left(\mathbf{x}_{ijkr} | p_{mijkr}\right), \tag{2.1}$$

where $f\left(\cdot | p_{mijkr}\right)$ is the Bernoulli mass function given by

$$f\left(\mathbf{x}_{ijkr} | p_{mijkr}\right) = \left\{p_{mijkr}\right\}^{x^1_{ijkr}+x^2_{ijkr}} \left\{1 - p_{mijkr}\right\}^{2-(x^1_{ijkr}+x^2_{ijkr})}, \tag{2.2}$$

and M denotes the *maximum* number of mixture components.

Allocation variables z_{ijk}, with probability distribution

$$[z_{ijk} = m] = \pi_{mijk}, \tag{2.3}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$ and $m = 1, \ldots, M$, allow representation of (2.1) as

$$[\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk} | z_{ijk}] = \prod_{r=1}^{L} f\left(\mathbf{x}_{ijkr} | p_{z_{ijk}ijkr}\right). \tag{2.4}$$

Following Majumdar, Bhattacharya, Basu & Ghosh (2013), Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*), we set $\pi_{mijk} = 1/M$, for $m = 1, \ldots, M$, and for all (j, k).

Letting $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk} = (p_{mijk1}, p_{mijk2}, \ldots, p_{mijkL})$, we next assume that

$$\boldsymbol{p}_{1ijk}, \boldsymbol{p}_{2ijk}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_{Mijk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \boldsymbol{G}_{ijk}; \tag{2.5}$$

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{ijk} \sim \text{DP}\left(\alpha_{G,ik} \boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\right), \tag{2.6}$$

where $\text{DP}\left(\alpha_{G,ik} \boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\right)$ stands for Dirichlet process with expected probability measure $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ having precision parameter $\alpha_{G,ik}$, with

$$\log(\alpha_{G,ik}) = \mu_G + \boldsymbol{\beta}_G^T \boldsymbol{E}_{ik}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$ is a d-dimensional vector of continuous environmental variable for the i-th individual in the k-th group, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$ is a d-dimensional vector of regression coefficients, and α_G is the intercept term. The model can be easily extended to include categorical environmental variables along with the continuous ones.

2.3 Hierarchical Dirichlet processes to introduce dependence between the genes and case-control status

We further assume that for $k = 0, 1$,

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk} \overset{iid}{\sim} DP\left(\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k\right);\ j = 1, \ldots, J, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\log(\alpha_{G_{0,k}}) = \mu_{G_0} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}^T \bar{\boldsymbol{E}}_k, \tag{2.9}$$

with

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{E}}_k = \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \boldsymbol{E}_{ik}. \tag{2.10}$$

We postulate the last level of hierarchy as

$$\boldsymbol{H}_k \overset{iid}{\sim} DP\left(\alpha_H \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}\right);\ k = 0, 1, \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$\log(\alpha_H) = \mu_H + \boldsymbol{\beta}_H^T \bar{\bar{\boldsymbol{E}}}, \tag{2.12}$$

with

$$\bar{\bar{\boldsymbol{E}}} = \frac{\bar{\boldsymbol{E}}_0 + \bar{\boldsymbol{E}}_1}{2}. \tag{2.13}$$

We specify the base probability measure $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$ as follows: for $m = 1, \ldots, M$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$, $k = 0, 1$, and $r = 1, \ldots, L$,

$$p_{mijkr} \overset{iid}{\sim} \text{Beta}\left(\nu_1, \nu_2\right), \tag{2.14}$$

under $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$, where $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$.

This completes the specification of a hierarchy of Dirichlet processes to build dependence between the genes and case-control status. Note that our model consists of one more level of hierarchy of Dirichlet processes than considered in the applications of Teh et al. (2006), who introduce

hierarchical Dirichlet processes (HDP). Moreover, our likelihood based on Dirichlet processes ensuring at most M mixture components, is significantly different from those considered in the applications of Teh et al. (2006), which are based on the traditional DP mixture; see Mukhopadhyay, Bhattacharya & Dihidar (2011), Mukhopadhyay, Roy & Bhattacharya (2012), Mukhopadhyay & Bhattacharya (2013) for details on the conceptual, computational and asymptotic advantages of our modeling style over the traditional DP mixture.

2.4 **The Chinese restaurant analogy**

An extended version of the Chinese restaurant metaphor used by Teh et al. (2006) may be considered to illustrate our model. For $k = 0, 1$, the set of random probability measures $\{\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}; j = 1, \ldots, J\}$ can be associated with J restaurants. Letting τ_{ijk} denote the number of tables at the j-th restaurant associated with the i-th individual, we denote by $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}$ the dish being served at table t of the j-th restaurant for the i-th individual. Note that $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}; t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}; i = 1, \ldots, N_k\right\}$ is a set of iid realizations from $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$. Thus, we have different sets of realizations from $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ for different individuals i.

For $k = 0, 1$, we also let $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k k} = \left\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1k}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{R_k k}\right\}$ denote a set of R_k iid realizations from $\boldsymbol{H}_k$. Then it follows that for $t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$, and for $j = 1, \ldots, J$, $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk} \in \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k k}$. In other words, $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k k}$ is the set of distinct elements in the set $\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}; t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}; i = 1, \ldots, N_k; j = 1, \ldots, J\}$, and, from the Chinese restaurant perspective, is the set of global dishes among all the restaurants, given k.

Finally, let $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_S = \{\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_S\}$ denote a set of S iid realizations from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$. Then it follows that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_S$ is the set of distinct elements in $\{\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k k} : k = 0, 1\}$. In other words, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_S$ is the set of global dishes served in all the restaurants, irrespective of $k = 0$ or $k = 1$.

3. DISCUSSION OF THE DEPENDENCE STRUCTURE INDUCED BY OUR HDP-BASED MODEL

3.1 Dependence among individuals

It follows from the discussion in Section 2.4 that $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{lijk}; l = 1, \ldots, T_{mijk}; i = 1, \ldots, N_k\right\} \in \left\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1k}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{R_{mk}k}\right\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1k}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{R_{mk}k} \overset{iid}{\sim} \boldsymbol{H}_k$. This shows that $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{lijk}; l = 1, \ldots, T_{mijk}; i = 1, \ldots, N_k\right\}$ in (3.1) are shared among the individuals, thus creating dependence among the subjects.

For more precise insights regarding the dependence structure, let us first marginalize over $\boldsymbol{G}_{ijk}$ to obtain the joint distribution of $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk} = \left\{\boldsymbol{p}_{1ijk}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_{Mijk}\right\}$ using the following Polya urn distributions: given $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, $\boldsymbol{p}_{1ijk} \sim \boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, and for $m = 2, \ldots, M$,

$$[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\boldsymbol{p}_{lijk}; l < m] = \frac{\alpha_{G,ik}}{\alpha_{G,ik} + m - 1}\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha_{G,ik} + m - 1}\sum_{t=1}^{T_{mijk}} \tilde{n}_{tmijk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\sum_{t=1}^{T_{mijk}} \tilde{n}_{tmijk} = m - 1$. Here $\tilde{n}_{tmijk} = \#\left\{l < m : \boldsymbol{p}_{lijk} = \boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}\right\}$.

Since conditionally on $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, the marginal distribution of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$, for $m = 1, \ldots, M$ and $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$, is $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, the marginal is unaffected by the environmental variable, but the joint distribution of $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk}$ implied by the Polya urn distributions (3.1) shows that the dependence structure of $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk}$ is influenced by the regression on $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$ through $\alpha_{G,ik}$. This is a very desirable property of our modeling approach, since, in reality, the population minor allele frequencies for the case-control group are not expected to be affected by environmental variables, although environmental exposure is expected to influence dependence among individuals and gene-gene interactions in individuals. Note that marginal distributions depending upon environmental variables may be envisaged only under mutation, but since it is an extremely rare phenomenon, we do not include mutational effects in our model.

3.2 Dependence among the genes

We now show that the gene-gene interactions of the i-th individual are affected by $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$, but not the marginal effects of the genes.

Dependence among the genes for the i-th individual is induced by $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}; t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}; j = 1, \ldots, J\right\}$,

where, for $t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}$, $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, with $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk} \sim DP\left(\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k\right)$. In fact, marginalizing over $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ yields the following Polya urn scheme for $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}; t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}\right\}$:

$$[\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{lijk}; l < t] = \frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}}{\alpha_{G_0,k} + t - 1}\boldsymbol{H}_k\left(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha_{G_0,k} + t - 1}\sum_{l=1}^{R_{tk}} \bar{n}_{ltik}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}\left(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\bar{n}_{ltik} = \#\left\{l' < t : \boldsymbol{\phi}_{l'ijk} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}\right\}$. Note that $\sum_{l=1}^{R_{tk}} \bar{n}_{ltik} = t - 1$.

It is clear from (3.2) that $\left\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}; j = 1, \ldots, J\right\}$ share $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}; l = 1, \ldots, R_k\}$, so that the latter set creates dependence among the genes. Moreover, it is also clear from (3.2) that the dependence structure does not depend directly upon $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$, but upon $\bar{\boldsymbol{E}}_k$. In other words, the gene-gene dependence structure of any individual is not directly influenced by the corresponding environmental variable. However, the dependence structure is also influenced by $\bar{n}_{ltik}$, which depends upon the i-th individual in the k-th case-control group through τ_{ijk}, which is directly influenced by $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$ through $\alpha_{G,ik}$. Thus, as is desirable, our modeling style induces gene-gene interactions that are specific to the individuals and are influenced by the corresponding environmental variables and the averages of the environmental variables within the case-control groups that the individuals belong to.

It is also interesting to observe that in spite of the individual-specific gene-gene interactions, the marginal distributions of $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}$ remains $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ for the non-marginalized version and $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ for the marginalized version characterized by (3.2), signifying that the individual genes are not affected by $\boldsymbol{E}_{ik}$.

3.3 Case-control dependence

Finally, we note that

$$[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk}|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}; l < s] = \frac{\alpha_H}{\alpha_H + s - 1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}\left(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha_H + s - 1}\sum_{l=1}^{S_{sk}} \breve{n}_{lsk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_l}\left(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk}\right), \tag{3.3}$$

where $\breve{n}_{lsk} = \#\left\{l' < s : \boldsymbol{\xi}_{l'k} = \boldsymbol{\zeta}_l\right\}$ and $\sum_{l=1}^{S_{sk}} \breve{n}_{lsk} = s - 1$. So, $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk}; s = 1, \ldots, R_k; k = 0, 1\}$ share $\{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_l; l = 1, \ldots, S\}$, creating dependence between case and control status. Dependence between case and control status are likely to be caused by various implicit factors and environmental

variables that are not accounted for in the study. These factors and environmental variables may be insignificant individually, but together may exert non-negligible influence on cases and controls.

In the next section we propose an MCMC procedure for the inferential purpose, and in Section 5 we provide a parallel algorithm for implementing the MCMC method.

4. AN MCMC METHOD USING GIBBS SAMPLING AND TMCMC

4.1 Full conditionals

4.1.1. **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{H}_k$** First observe that for $k = 0, 1$, the full conditional of $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ is given by

$$[\boldsymbol{H}_k|\cdots] \sim DP\left(\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}, \frac{\alpha_H \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}} + \sum_{s=1}^{S} n_{sk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_s}}{\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}}\right), \tag{4.1}$$

where $n_{sk} = \#\{r \in \{1, \ldots, R_k\} : \boldsymbol{\xi}_{rk} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_s\}$ and $n_{\cdot k} = \sum_{s=1}^{S} n_{sk}$.

4.1.2. **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$** Similarly, the full conditional of $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ is given, for $j = 1, \ldots, J$ and $k = 0, 1$, by

$$[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\cdots] \sim DP\left(\alpha_{G_0,k} + n_{\cdot jk}, \frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k} + n_{\cdot jk}}\right), \tag{4.2}$$

where $n_{ljk} = \#\{(t, i) \in \{1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}\} \times \{1, \ldots, N_k\} : \boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}\}$ and $n_{\cdot jk} = \sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk}$.

The full conditionals of $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ given by (4.1) and (4.2) indicate generating the infinite-dimensional random probability measures using Sethuraman's characterization of Dirichlet processes (see Sethuraman (1994)). However, in our case, forming the infinite-dimensional Sethuraman's construction is not necessary; instead, it will be required to simulate from the random probability measures having distributions (4.1) and (4.2). Such simulations are possible using the retrospective method (see Papaspiliopoulos & Roberts (2008)) which avoids dealing with infinitely many objects.

4.1.3. **Full conditional of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$** The associated Polya urn distribution of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$ given $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk}\backslash\{\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\}$, derived by marginalizing over $\boldsymbol{G}_{ijk}$, is the following:

$$\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk}\backslash\{\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\}\right] = \frac{\alpha_{G,ik}}{\alpha_{G,ik}+M-1}\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha_{G,ik}+M-1}\sum_{m'\neq m=1}^{M}\delta_{\boldsymbol{p}_{m'ijk}}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right) \tag{4.3}$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_{G,ik}}{\alpha_{G,ik}+M-1}\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha_{G,ik}+M-1}\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{ijk}}M_{tijk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right). \tag{4.4}$$

where $M_{tijk} = \#\{m' \in \{1,\ldots,M\}\backslash\{m\} : \boldsymbol{p}_{m'ijk} = \boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}\}$ and $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}}(\cdot)$ denotes point mass at $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}$.

Given $z_{ijk} = m$, on combining the Polya urn distribution with the likelihood $\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|p_{mijkr})$ we obtain the following full conditional of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$:

$$\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right] \propto \alpha_{G,ik}\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|p_{mijkr})\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{ijk}}M_{tijk}\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tijkr})\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right). \tag{4.5}$$

Note that in (4.5), $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, drawn from (4.2), is not available in closed form and only admits the form dictated by Sethuraman's construction, given, almost surely, by

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\tilde{p}_l\delta_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk}}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\tilde{p}_1 = V_1$, $\tilde{p}_l = V_l\prod_{s<l}(1-V_s)$, for $l \geq 2$, with $V_1, V_2, \ldots \overset{iid}{\sim} \text{Beta}\left(\alpha_{G_0,k}+n_{\cdot jk}, 1\right)$, and for $l = 1, 2, \ldots$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k+\sum_{l=1}^{R_k}n_{ljk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k}+n_{\cdot jk}}$.

In (4.5), the posterior proportional to $\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|p_{mijkr})\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)$, which we denote by $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$, is the discrete distribution that puts mass $C_{ijk}\tilde{p}_t\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{tjkr})$ to the point $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{tjk}$, for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, where

$$C_{ijk} = \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\tilde{p}_t\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{tjkr})\right)^{-1} \tag{4.7}$$

is the normalizing constant. Combining these with (4.5) it follows that

$$\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right] = \alpha_{G,ik}\bar{C}C_{ijk}^{-1}[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}] + \bar{C}\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{ijk}} M_{tijk}\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tijkr})\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right), \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\bar{C} = \left[\alpha_{G,ik}C_{jk}^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{ijk}} M_{tijk}\prod_{r=1}^{L_j} f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tijkr})\right]^{-1}$$

is the normalizing constant of $\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right]$.

4.2 Retrospective method for simulating from $\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right]$

From (4.8) it follows that, to draw from $\left[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\cdots\right]$, it is required to simulate from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$ with probability proportional to C_{ijk}^{-1}. However, since C_{ijk} involves an infinite series, its calculation is infeasible. The same issue also prevents the traditional simulation methods to draw from the discrete distribution $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$. In this case, the retrospective sampling method proposed in Section 3.5 of Papaspiliopoulos & Roberts (2008) is the appropriate method for our purpose. We first briefly discuss the role of such method in simulating from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$, and then argue that a by-product of the method can be used to estimate C_{ijk} arbitrarily accurately.

4.2.1. **Retrospective method to draw from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$** Note that the retrospective method requires $\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tijkr})$ in our case to be uniformly bounded for all $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}$, which holds in our case, as $f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tjkr})$ represents the Bernoulli distribution, which is bounded above by 1. We briefly describe the method as follows. Let

$$c_\ell(K) = \sum_{a=1}^{K}\tilde{p}_a\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{ajkr}) \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$c_u(K) = c_\ell(K) + (1 - \sum_{a=1}^{K}\tilde{p}_a). \tag{4.10}$$

Let us also define $\breve{p}_{\ell,a}(K) = \tilde{p}_a \prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{ajkr})/c_\ell(K)$ and $\breve{p}_{u,a}(K) = \tilde{p}_a \prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{ajkr})/c_u(K)$. To simulate from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$ we first generate $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)$, and given U, choose $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{tjk}$ when

$$\sum_{a=1}^{t-1} \breve{p}_{u,a}(K) \leq U \leq \sum_{a=1}^{t} \breve{p}_{\ell,a}(K). \tag{4.11}$$

In fact, K needs to be increased and $\tilde{p}_t$ and $\prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\tilde{\xi}_{ajkr})$ simulated retrospectively, till (4.11) is satisfied for some $t \leq K$.

4.2.2. **Retrospective method for estimating C_{ijk} arbitrarily accurately** By choosing K to be large enough, the quantities $c_\ell(K)$ and $c_u(K)$ given by (4.9) and (4.10), respectively, can be made arbitrarily close. In other words, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $K_0 \geq 1$ such that $|c_\ell(K) - c_u(K)| < \epsilon$, for $K \geq K_0$. Thus, for any such $K \geq K_0$, one may approximate C_{ijk} with $[c_\ell(K)]^{-1}$. In practice, it is only required to simulate $\tilde{U} \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)$ and simulate from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right)|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$ if $\tilde{U} \leq \bar{C}C_{ijk}^{-1}$. For sufficiently small ϵ and for finite number of simulations, it will generally hold that $\tilde{U} \leq \bar{C}C_{ijk}^{-1}$ if and only if $\tilde{U} \leq \bar{C}_\epsilon c_\ell(K)$, for $K \geq K_0$, where

$$\bar{C}_\epsilon = \left[c_\ell^{-1}(K) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{ijk}} M_{tijk} \prod_{r=1}^{L} f(x_{ijkr}|\phi_{tijkr}) \right]^{-1}.$$

4.2.3. **Retrospective method to simulate from $\frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k}+n_{\cdot jk}}$** Note that the retrospective simulation method requires simulation of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \frac{\alpha_{G_0,k}\boldsymbol{H}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k}+n_{\cdot jk}}$, for $l = 1, 2, \ldots$. This requires simulation from $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ with probability proportional to $\alpha_{G_0,k}$. For this, we first simulate $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)$. We then simulate a realization from $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ after generating $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ from the Dirichlet process given by (4.1). Note that we do not have to generate the entire random probability measure $\boldsymbol{H}_k$ for this; we only need to generate as many realizations $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{lk}^*$'s from $\frac{\alpha_H \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}} + \sum_{s=1}^{S} n_{sk}\delta_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_s}}{\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}}$ and as many $p_{lk}^* = V_{lk}^* \prod_{s<l}(1 - V_{lk}^*)$; $l = 1, 2 \ldots$, with $p_{1k}^* = V_{1k}^*$, with $V_{lk}^* \overset{iid}{\sim} \text{Beta}\,(\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}, 1)$, as required to satisfy $\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} p_{lk}^* < U \leq \sum_{l=1}^{t} p_{lk}^*$, for some $t \geq 1$ (with $p_0^* = 0$). We then report $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{1jk} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{tk}^*$ with probability proportional to $\alpha_{G_0,k}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{1jk} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\tilde{l}jk}$ with probability proportional to $n_{\tilde{l}jk}$, for $\tilde{l} \in \{1, \ldots, R_k\}$. We repeat this procedure for generating $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{ljk}$; $l \geq 2$, by sequentially augmenting the existing simulations of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{lk}^*$'s and p_{lk}^*'s with new draws from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$ and Beta $(\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}, 1)$,

if needed. Indeed, note that for augmentation of p^*_{lk}'s, only extra V^*_{lk}'s need to be generated from Beta $(\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}, 1)$.

4.3 Updating procedure of z_{ijk} and $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$

The full conditional of z_{ijk} is given by the following:

$$[z_{ijk} = m|\cdots] \propto \pi_{mijk} \prod_{r=1}^{L_j} f\left(\mathbf{x}_{ijkr}|p_{mijkr}\right); \tag{4.12}$$

for $m = 1, \ldots, M$.

In Section 4.2 we have devised a method of simulating from the full conditional of $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$ given the data and the remaining variables. For our convenience, we re-formulate the full conditional in terms of the dishes $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tjk}$ and the indicators of the dishes, which we denote by t_{mijk}, where $t_{mijk} = t$ if and only if $p_{mijk} = \phi_{tijk}$; $t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}$.

Now let $\tau^{(m)}_{ijk}$ denote the number of elements in $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk} \backslash \left\{\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}\right\}$ that arose from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$. Also let $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{m*}_{tijk} = \left\{\phi^{m*}_{tijkr};\ r = 1, \ldots, L\right\};\ t = 1, \ldots, \tau^{(m)}_{ijk}$ denote the parameter vectors arising from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$. Further, let $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{m*}_{tijk}$ occur M_{mtijk} times.

Then we update t_{mijk} using Gibbs steps, where the full conditional distribution of t_{mijk} is given by

$$[t_{mijk} = t|\cdots] \propto \begin{cases} q^*_{t,mijk} & \text{if} \quad t = 1, \ldots, \tau^{(m)}_{ijk}; \\ q_{0,mijk} & \text{if} \quad t = \tau^{(m)}_{ijk} + 1, \end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$q_{0,mijk} = \alpha_{G,ik} C^{-1}_{ijk}; \tag{4.14}$$

$$q^*_{t,mijk} = M_{mtijk} \prod_{r=1}^{L_j} \left\{\phi^{m*}_{tijkr}\right\}^{n_{1mijkr}} \left\{1 - \phi^{m*}_{tijkr}\right\}^{n_{2mijkr}}. \tag{4.15}$$

In (4.14) and (4.15), n_{1mijkr} and n_{2mijkr} denote the number of "a" and "A" alleles, respectively, at the r-th locus of the j-th gene of the i-th individual, associated with the m-th mixture component. In other words, $n_{1mijkr} = x^1_{ijkr} + x^2_{ijkr}$ and $n_{2mijkr} = 2 - \left(x^1_{ijkr} + x^2_{ijkr}\right)$.

Let $n^*_{1tijkr} = \sum_{m:t_{mijk}=t} n_{1mijkr}$ and $n^*_{2tijkr} = \sum_{m:t_{mijk}=t} n_{2mijkr}$. Then, for $t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}$; $r = 1, \ldots, L_j$; $j = 1, \ldots, J$ and $k = 0, 1$, update $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{tijk}$ by simulating from its full conditional

distribution, given by

$$[\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{tijk}|\cdots] \sim [\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}|\boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]. \tag{4.16}$$

The above simulation from $[\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{tijk}|\cdots]$ is to be carried out by the retrospective method discussed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.3.

4.4 Updating the missing data $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}$

From (2.4) it follows that

$$[\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}|z_{ijk}] = \prod_{r=L_j+1}^{L} f\left(\boldsymbol{y}_{ijkr}|p_{z_{ijk}ijkr}\right). \tag{4.17}$$

Hence, given the other unknowns, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}$ can be updated by simply simulating from the Bernoulli distributions given by (4.17).

4.5 Updating μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$ using TMCMC

4.5.1. **Relevant factors for updating μ_G and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$** Let

$$\mathcal{L}_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G) = \prod_{k=0}^{1}\prod_{i=1}^{N_k}\prod_{j=1}^{J}\prod_{m=2}^{M}[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\boldsymbol{p}_{lijk}; l < m],$$

where $[\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}|\boldsymbol{p}_{lijk}; l < m]$ is given by (3.1). Let $\pi_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G)$ denote the prior on $(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G)$. Note that $\pi_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G)\mathcal{L}_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G)$ is the product of the only factors in the joint model consisting of μ_G and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$.

4.5.2. **Relevant factors for updating μ_{G_0} and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$** Now let

$$\mathcal{L}_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}) == \prod_{k=0}^{1}\prod_{i=1}^{N_k}\prod_{j=1}^{J}\prod_{t=2}^{\tau_{ijk}}[\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{lijk}; l < t],$$

where $[\boldsymbol{\phi}_{tijk}|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{lijk}; l < t]$ is given by (3.2).

Let $\pi_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0})$ denote the prior on $(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0})$. Then $\pi_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0})\mathcal{L}_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0})$ is the functional form associated with μ_{G_0} and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$.

4.5.3. **Relevant factors for updating μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$** Finally, we let

$$\mathcal{L}_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H) = \prod_{k=0}^{1} \prod_{s=2}^{R_k} [\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}; l < s],$$

where $[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sk} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}; l < s]$ is given y (3.3).

Let $\pi_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)$ be the prior on $(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)$. Then $\pi_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)\mathcal{L}_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)$ is the functional form to be considered for updating μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$.

4.5.4. **Mixture of additive and multiplicative TMCMC for updating μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$ in a single block** We shall update all the parameters μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$ using a mixture of additive and multiplicative TMCMC, where all the aforementioned parameters are given either the additive move or the multiplicative move with equal probability, and where the acceptance ratio will be calculated by evaluating the functional form

$$\pi_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G)\mathcal{L}_G(\mu_G, \boldsymbol{\beta}_G) \times \pi_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0})\mathcal{L}_{G_0}(\mu_{G_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}) \times \pi_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)\mathcal{L}_H(\mu_H, \boldsymbol{\beta}_H)$$

at the numerator and the denominator corresponding to the proposed and the current values of μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$, with all other unknowns held fixed at their current values, multiplied by an appropriate Jacobian whenever the multiplicative move is chosen. For details regarding mixture of additive and multiplicative TMCMC, see Dey & Bhattacharya (2016).

5. A PARALLEL ALGORITHM FOR IMPLEMENTING OUR MCMC PROCEDURE

Recall that the mixtures associated with gene $j \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$, and individual $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_k\}$ and case-control status $k \in \{0, 1\}$, are conditionally independent of each other, given the interaction parameters. This allows us to update the mixture components in separate parallel processors, conditionally on the interaction parameters. Once the mixture components are updated, we update the interaction parameters using a specialized form of TMCMC, in a single processor. Furthermore, the parameters of the HDP are also amenable to efficient parallelization. The details are as follows.

(1) (a) In processes numbered 0 and 1, simultaneously obtain the set of distinct elements $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k,k}; k = 0, 1$, from $\{\phi_{tijk}; t = 1, \ldots, \tau_{ijk}; i = 1, \ldots, N_k; j = 1, \ldots, J\}; k = 0, 1$.

(b) Communicate $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k,k}$; $k = 0, 1$, to all the processes.

(2) (a) In process 0, obtain the set of distinct elements $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_S$ from $\{\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{R_k,k}; k = 0, 1\}$.

(b) Communicate $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_S$ to all the processes.

(3) In processes numbered 0 and 1, do the following in parallel for $k = 0, 1$:

(a) Simulate, following the retrospective method detailed in Section 4.2.3, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*_{lk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \frac{\alpha_H \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}} + \sum_{s=1}^{S} n_{sk} \delta_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_s}}{\alpha_H + n_{\cdot k}}$; $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathcal{L}$, for sufficiently large $\mathcal{L}$.

(b) Communicate the simulated values to all the processes.

(3) Split $\{(j, k) : \ j = 1, \ldots, J; \ k = 0, 1\}$ in the available parallel processes.

(a) For each (j, k), simulate, following the retrospective method detailed in Section 4.2.3, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk} \overset{iid}{\sim} \frac{\alpha_{G_0,k} \boldsymbol{H}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{R_k} n_{ljk} \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{lk}}}{\alpha_{G_0,k} + n_{\cdot jk}}$; $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathcal{L}$.

(b) Communicate the simulated values to all the processes.

(4) (a) Split the triplets $\{(i, j, k) : \ i = 1, \ldots, N_k; \ j = 1, \ldots, J; \ k = 0, 1\}$ in the available parallel processes sequentially into

$$\mathcal{T}_1 = \{(i, j, 0) : \ i = 1, \ldots, N_0; \ j = 1, \ldots, J\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = \{(i, j, 1) : \ i = 1, \ldots, N_1; \ j = 1, \ldots, J\}.$$

(b) Then parallelise updation of the mixtures associated with $\mathcal{T}_1$, followed by those of $\mathcal{T}_2$.

(c) If, for any (i, j, k), retrospective simulation from $[\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk} | \boldsymbol{X}_{ijk}]$ requires more than $\mathcal{L}$ simulations of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk}$ in step (3) (a), then increase $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathcal{L}^*$, and

(i) For $k = 0, 1$, augment the simulations of $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^*_{lk}; l = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}\}$ with new simulations $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^*_{lk}; l = \mathcal{L} + 1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}^*\}$.

(ii) For $j = 1, \ldots, J$ and for $k = 0, 1$, augment the simulations of $\left\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk}; l = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}\right\}$ with new simulations $\left\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{ljk}; l = \mathcal{L} + 1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}^*\right\}$.

(iii) Repeat (4) (a) and (4) (b).

(5) During each MCMC iteration, for each (i, j, k) in each available parallel processor, update the allocation variables z_{ijk}, the proportions $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$; $m = 1, \ldots, M$, and the missing data $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{ijk}$, using the methods proposed in Sections 4.3 and 4.4.

(6) Communicate the results of updating in (4) and (5) to all the processes.

(7) (a) During each MCMC iteration, update the parameters μ_G, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_G$, μ_{G_0}, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{G_0}$, μ_H and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_H$ using additive TMCMC in a single block, as proposed in Section 4.5, in process number 0.

(b) Communicate the updated results to all the processes.

6. DETECTION OF THE ROLES OF ENVIRONMENT, GENES AND THEIR INTERACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO OUR HDP BASED MODEL

6.1 Formulation of the tests and interpretation of their results

6.1.1. **Bayesian test for the impact of the genes on case-control** To test if genes have any effect on case-control, we formulate as in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), the following hypotheses:

$$H_{01} : h_{0j} = h_{1j};\ j = 1, \ldots, J, \tag{6.1}$$

versus

$$H_{11} : \text{not } H_0, \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$h_{0j}(\cdot) = \prod_{i=1}^{N_0} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_{mijk=0} \prod_{r=1}^{L_j} f\left(\cdot | p^r_{mijk=0}\right) \right\}; \tag{6.3}$$

$$h_{1j}(\cdot) = \prod_{i=1}^{N_1} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_{mijk=1} \prod_{r=1}^{L_j} f\left(\cdot | p^r_{mijk=1}\right) \right\}. \tag{6.4}$$

6.1.2. **Bayesian test for the significance of the environmental variables** To check if the environmental variables are significant, we shall test the following: for $\ell = 1, \ldots, d$,

$$H_{02\ell} : \beta_{G,\ell} = 0 \text{ versus } H_{12\ell} : \beta_{G,\ell} \neq 0, \tag{6.5}$$

$$H_{03\ell} : \beta_{G_0,\ell} = 0 \text{ versus } H_{13\ell} : \beta_{G_0,\ell} \neq 0, \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$H_{04\ell} : \beta_{H,\ell} = 0 \text{ versus } H_{14\ell} : \beta_{H,\ell} \neq 0. \tag{6.7}$$

6.1.3. **Bayesian test for significance of gene-gene interaction** In our HDP based nonparametric model there is no readily available quantification of gene-gene interaction unlike the models of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). Thus, in order to test for gene-gene interaction, it is necessary to first reasonably define such a measurement.

A measure of gene-gene interaction influenced by environmental variables For our purpose, we first define

$$\bar{p}_{mijk} = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^{L_j} p_{mijkr}}{L_j}. \tag{6.8}$$

With the above definition, for subject i belonging to case-control group k, we consider the following covariance

$$C(i, j_1, j_2, k) = cov\left(\text{logit}(\bar{p}_{z_{ij_1k}ij_1k}), \text{logit}(\bar{p}_{z_{ij_2k}ij_2k})\right), \tag{6.9}$$

as quantification of subject-wise gene-gene dependence that accounts for population memberships of subject i with respect to genes j_1 and j_2, through z_{ij_1k} and z_{ij_2k}. Thus, gene-gene interaction associated with our model is subject-specific.

While implementing our model using our parallelised MCMC methodology, we simulate $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$ at each iteration by generating $\{p_{mijkr} : r = 1, \ldots, L_j\}$ as many times as required from the respective full conditionals holding the remaining parameters fixed, and then compute the empirical covariance corresponding to (6.9) using the generated iid samples conditionally on the remaining parameters to approximate (6.9).

Formulation of the Bayesian tests for gene-gene interactions To test for subject-wise gene-gene interaction, we consider the following tests: for $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$, $k = 0, 1$, and for $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$,

$$H_{05ij_1j_2k} : C(i, j_1, j_2, k) = 0 \text{ versus } H_{15ij_1j_2k} : C(i, j_1, j_2, k) \neq 0. \tag{6.10}$$

6.1.4. **Interpretations of the results of the above tests** The cases that can possibly arise and the respective conclusions are the following:

- If $\max_{1 \leq j \leq J} d(h_{0j}, h_{1j})$ is significantly small with high posterior probability, then H_{01} is to be accepted. If h_{0j} and h_{1j} are not significantly different, then it is plausible to conclude that the j-th gene is not marginally significant in the case-control study.

- Suppose that H_{01} is accepted (so that genes have no significant role) and that at least one of $\beta_{G,\ell}$ or $\beta_{G_0,\ell}$ or $\beta_{H,\ell}$ is significant, at least for some ℓ. This may be interpreted as the environmental variable $\boldsymbol{E}$ having some altering effect on all the genes in a way that doesn't affect the disease status. If $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$ turns out to be significant, then this would additionally imply that the environmental variable $\boldsymbol{E}$ influences interaction between genes j_1 and j_2 for the i-th individual, but not in a way that is responsible for the case/control status.

- If H_{01} is rejected, indicating that the genes are significant, but none of the $\beta_{G,\ell}$, $\beta_{G_0,\ell}$, $\beta_{H,\ell}$ or $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$ are significant, then only the genes, not $\boldsymbol{E}$, are responsible for the disease. In that case, one may conclude that the disease is of purely genetic nature.

- Suppose that H_{01} is rejected, none of $\beta_{G,\ell}$, $\beta_{G_0,\ell}$, $\beta_{H,\ell}$ is significant, but $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$ is significant for at least some i, j_1, j_2, k. Then the environmental variable is not significant, and the case/control status of the individuals associated with significant gene-gene interactions can be attributed to purely genetic causes triggered by gene-gene interactions of the individuals.

- Now suppose that H_{01} is rejected, and at least one of $\beta_{G,\ell}$, $\beta_{G_0,\ell}$, $\beta_{H,\ell}$ is significant, but none of the subject-wise gene-gene interactions is significant. Then the environmental variable

$\boldsymbol{E}$ does not significantly affect the interactions to determine the case/control status, and marginal effects of the individual genes are responsible for the case/control status of an individual.

- If, on the other hand, H_{01} is rejected, at least one of $\beta_{G,\ell}$, $\beta_{G_0,\ell}$, $\beta_{H,\ell}$ is significant, and $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$ is significant for at least some i, j_1, j_2, k, then the environmental variable is significant and is responsible for influencing gene-gene interactions within the individuals with significant $C(i, j_1, j_2, k)$, which, in turn, affects the case/control status of the individuals.

6.2 Methodologies for implementing the Bayesian tests

6.2.1. **Hypothesis testing based on clustering modes** As in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), here we exploit the concept of "central" clustering introduced by Mukhopadhyay et al. (2011). Briefly, central clustering may be interpreted as a suitable measure of central tendency of a set of clusterings. Mukhopadhyay et al. (2011) particularly consider the mode(s) of the set of clusterings, and provide methods for appropriately obtaining the mode(s) using a suitable metric that they propose to quantify distances between any two clusterings. Their proposed metric is also computationally inexpensive, which makes the concept based on central clusterings extremely useful in practice.

For $k = 0, 1$, let i_k denote the index of the central clusterings of $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mijk} = \left\{\boldsymbol{p}_{1ijk}, \boldsymbol{p}_{2ijk}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_{Mijk}\right\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$. We then study the divergence between the two clusterings of

$$\boldsymbol{P}_{Mi_0jk=0} = \left\{\boldsymbol{p}_{1i_0jk=0}, \boldsymbol{p}_{2i_0jk=0}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_{Mi_0jk=0}\right\}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{P}_{Mi_1jk=1} = \left\{\boldsymbol{p}_{1i_1jk=1}, \boldsymbol{p}_{2i_1jk=1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_{Mi_1jk=1}\right\},$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, J$. A schematic diagram illustrating the idea can be found in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*).

Significantly large divergence between the two clusterings clearly indicates that the j-th gene is marginally significant.

6.2.2. **Enhancement of clustering metric based inference using Euclidean distance** As argued in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*), significantly large clustering distance between $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mjk=0}$ and $\boldsymbol{P}_{Mjk=1}$ indicates rejection of H_0, but insignificant clustering distance does not necessarily provide strong evidence in favour of the null. In this regard, Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) (see also Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*)) argue that the Euclidean distance is an appropriate candidate to be tested for significance before arriving at the final conclusion. Briefly, we first compute the averages $\bar{p}_{mijk} = \sum_{r=1}^{L_j} p_{m,ijkr}/L_j$, then consider their logit transformations $\text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{mijk}) = \log\{\bar{p}_{mijk}/(1-\bar{p}_{mijk})\}$. Then, we compute the Euclidean distance between the vectors

$$\text{logit}\left(\bar{\boldsymbol{P}}_{Mi_0jk=0}\right) = \{\text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{1i_0jk=0})\,, \text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{2i_0jk=0})\,, \ldots, \text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{Mi_0jk=0})\}$$

and

$$\text{logit}\left(\bar{\boldsymbol{P}}_{Mi_1jk=1}\right) = \{\text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{1i_1jk=1})\,, \text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{2i_1jk=1})\,, \ldots, \text{logit}\,(\bar{p}_{Mi_1jk=1})\}\,.$$

We denote the Euclidean distance associated with the j-th gene by

$$d_{E,j} = d_{E,j}\left(\text{logit}\left(\bar{\boldsymbol{P}}_{Mi_0jk=0}\right), \text{logit}\left(\bar{\boldsymbol{P}}_{Mi_1jk=1}\right)\right),$$

and denote $\max\limits_{1\le j\le J} d_{E,j}$ by d_E^*.

6.2.3. **Formal Bayesian hypothesis testing procedure integrating the above developments** In our problem, we need to test the following for reasonably small choices of ε's:

$$H_{0,d^*}:\ d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}\ \text{ versus }\ H_{1,d^*}:\ d^* \ge \varepsilon_{d^*};\tag{6.11}$$

$$H_{0,d_E^*}:\ d_E^* < \varepsilon_{d_E^*}\ \text{ versus }\ H_{1,d_E^*}:\ d_E^* \ge \varepsilon_{d_E^*};\tag{6.12}$$

for $\ell = 1, \ldots, d$,

$$H_{0,\beta_{G,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{G,\ell}| < \varepsilon_{G,\ell}\ \text{ versus }\ H_{1,\beta_{G,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{G,\ell}| \ge \varepsilon_{G,\ell},\tag{6.13}$$

$$H_{0,\beta_{G_0,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{G_0,\ell}| < \varepsilon_{G_0,\ell}\ \text{ versus }\ H_{1,\beta_{G_0,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{G_0,\ell}| \ge \varepsilon_{G_0,\ell},\tag{6.14}$$

$$H_{0,\beta_{H,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{H,\ell}| < \varepsilon_{H,\ell}\ \text{ versus }\ H_{1,\beta_{H,\ell}}:\ |\beta_{H,\ell}| \ge \varepsilon_{H,\ell},\tag{6.15}$$

and, for $i = 1, \ldots, N_k$, $k = 0, 1$, $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$,

$$H_{0,C_{i,j_1,j_2,k}} : \ |C_{i,j_1,j_2,k}| < \varepsilon_{C,ij_1j_2k} \ \text{ versus } \ H_{1,C_{i,j_1,j_2,k}} : \ |C_{i,j_1,j_2,k}| \geq \varepsilon_{C,ij_1j_2k}, \tag{6.16}$$

If H_0 is rejected in (6.11) or in (6.12), we could also test if the j-th gene is influential by testing, for $j = 1, \ldots, J$, $H_{0,\hat{d}_j} : \ \hat{d}_j < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_j}$ versus $H_{1,\hat{d}_j} : \ \hat{d}_j \geq \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_j}$, where $\hat{d}_j = \hat{d}\left(\boldsymbol{P}_{Mi_0jk=0}, \boldsymbol{P}_{Mi_1jk=0}\right)$; we could also test $H_{0,d_{E,j}} : \ d_{E,j} < \varepsilon_{d_{E,j}}$ versus $H_{1,d_{E,j}} : \ d_{E,j} \geq \varepsilon_{d_{E,j}}$.

6.2.4. **Null model and choice of ε** To obtain the null posterior distribution, we fit our HDP-based Bayesian model to the dataset generated from the HDP-based model where the genes are independent and not influenced by the environmental variable, and where there is no difference between the probabilities associated with case and control. For the null data we chose the same number of genes, the same number of loci for each gene, and the same number of cases and controls as the non-null data. We also choose the same value M as in the non-null model, but set $\beta_G = \beta_{G_0} = \beta_H = 0$. To generate the data from the null model, we first simulate, independently for $j = 1, \ldots, J$, the set $\{\boldsymbol{p}_{m1j0} : m = 1, \ldots, M\}$, using the Polya urn scheme involving $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$ and α_H, and set $\{\boldsymbol{p}_{m1j1} : m = 1, \ldots, M\} = \{\boldsymbol{p}_{m1j0} : m = 1, \ldots, M\}$, so that there is no difference between the probabilities associated with case and control, and that the genes are independent. Since the simulation method is independent of the environmental variable, it is clear that the genes are not influenced by the environment. Given the probabilities $\{\boldsymbol{p}_{m1j1} : m = 1, \ldots, M\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{p}_{m1j0} : m = 1, \ldots, M\}$, we then simulate the data using our Bernoulli model. To the data thus generated, we fit our full HDP-based Bayesian model, to obtain the null posterior.

As in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) here also we specify ε's as $F^{-1}(0.55)$, where F is the distribution function of the relevant benchmark null posterior distribution. Recall that the choice $F^{-1}(0.55)$, rather than the median, ensures that the correct null hypothesis is accepted under the "$0-1$" loss. Note that, for the median, the posterior probability of the true null is 0.5, while under the "$0-1$" loss, the true null will be accepted if its posterior probability is greater than $1/2$.

7. SIMULATION STUDIES

For simulation studies, we first generate realistic biological data for stratified population with known gene-environment interaction from the GENS2 software of Pinelli, Scala, Amato, Cocozza & Miele (2012). To this data, we then apply our model and methodologies in an effort to detect gene-environment interaction effects that are present in the data. We consider simulation studies in 5 different true model set-ups: (a) presence of gene-gene and gene-environment interaction, (b) absence of genetic or gene-environmental interaction effect, (c) absence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but presence of environmental effect, (d) presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect, and (e) independent and additive genetic and environmental effects.

As we demonstrate, our model and methodologies successfully identify the effects of the individual genes, gene-gene and gene-environment interactions, and the number of sub-populations. In all our applications, we set $M = 30$, $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1$, so that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$ is the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. We set $\alpha_{G,ik} = 0.1 \times \exp\left(100 + \mu_G + \beta_G E_{ik}\right)$, $\alpha_{G_0,k} = 0.1 \times \exp\left(100 + \mu_{G_0} + \beta_{G_0} \bar{E}_k\right)$ and $\alpha_H = 0.1 \times \exp\left(100 + \mu_H + \beta_H \bar{\bar{E}}\right)$, where we assumed $\mu_G, \mu_{G_0}, \mu_H \overset{iid}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ and $\beta_G, \beta_{G_0}, \beta_H \overset{iid}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$. This structure ensured adequate number of sub-populations and satisfactory mixing of MCMC.

7.1 First simulation study: presence of gene-gene and gene-environment interaction

7.1.1. **Data description** As in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) we consider two genetic factors as allowed by GENS2 and simulated 5 data sets with gene-gene and gene-environment interaction with a one-dimensional environmental variable, associated with 5 sub-populations. One of the genes consists of 1084 SNPs and another has 1206 SNPs, with one disease pre-disposing locus (DPL) at each gene. There are 113 individuals in each of the 5 data sets, from which we selected a total of 100 individuals without replacement with probabilities assigned to the 5 data sets being $(0.1, 0.4, 0.2, 0.15, 0.15)$. Our final dataset consists of 46 cases and 54 controls. Since, in our case, the environmental variable is one-dimensional, $d = 1$.

7.1.2. **Model implementation** We implemented our parallel MCMC algorithm on 50 cores in a 64-bit VMware with 64-bit physical cores, each running at 2793.269 MHz. Our code is written in C in conjunction with the Message Passing Interface (MPI) protocol for parallelisation.

The total time taken to implement $30,000$ MCMC iterations, where the first $10,000$ are discarded as burn-in, is approximately 20 hours. We assessed convergence informally with trace plots, which indicated adequate mixing properties of our algorithm.

7.1.3. **Specifications of the thresholds ε's using null distributions** Following the method outlined in Section 6.2.4 and setting M to be 30, we obtain $\varepsilon_{d^*} = 0.200$, $\varepsilon_{\hat{d}_1} = 0.167$, $\varepsilon_{\hat{d}_2} = 0.167$, $\varepsilon_{d^*_E} = 0.250$, $\varepsilon_{d^*_{E,1}} = 0.185$, $\varepsilon_{d^*_{E,2}} = 0.173$, $\varepsilon_{\beta_G} = 0.874$, $\varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}} = 0.128$, $\varepsilon_{\beta_H} = 0.219$.

7.1.4. **Results of fitting our model** The posterior probabilities $P\left(d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}|\text{Data}\right)$, $P\left(\hat{d}_1 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_1}|\text{Data}\right)$ and $P\left(\hat{d}_2 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_2}|\text{Data}\right)$ empirically obtained from $20,000$ MCMC samples, turned out to be 0.378, 0.317 and 0.324, respectively. Hence, H_{0,d^*}, $H_{0,\hat{d}_1}$ and $H_{0,\hat{d}_2}$ are rejected, suggesting the influence of significant genetic effects in the case-control study.

However, $P\left(d^*_E < \varepsilon_{d^*_E}|\text{Data}\right)$, $P\left(\hat{d}_{E,1} < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_{E,1}}|\text{Data}\right)$ and $P\left(\hat{d}_{E,2} < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_{E,2}}|\text{Data}\right)$ are given, approximately, by 0.558, 0.561 and 0.550, respectively, which seem to contradict the results of the clustering based hypothesis tests. This can be explained as follows. Since $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$ are discrete, the parameters $\boldsymbol{p}_{mijk}$, even if generated from $\boldsymbol{G}_{0,jk}$, coincide with positive probability, so that the effective dimensionalities of logit $\left(\bar{P}_{Mi_0jk=0}\right)$ and logit $\left(\bar{P}_{Mi_1jk=1}\right)$ are drastically reduced, so that the Euclidean distance between these two vectors is substantially small. As such, the Euclidean distance fails to reject the null even if it is false. As noted in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), even the clustering metric in this scenario is not completely satisfactory since this involves clustering distance between two empirically obtained central clusterings which may not be very accurate unless the sample sizes for case and control are very large. However, compared to the Euclidean distance, the clustering metric turns out to be far more reliable.

To check the influence of the environmental variable on the genes we compute the posterior probabilities $P\left(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}\right)$, $P\left(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}\right)$ and $P\left(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}\right)$. The proba-

bilities turned out to be 0.544, 0.550 and 0.191, respectively, showing that β_H is very significant. That is, the environmental variable has a significant overall effect on the genes. Figure 7.1 depicts the posterior probabilities of no gene-gene interactions for the controls and cases, showing the prominence of several gene-gene interactions in both control and case groups. As to be expected, in the case group, more instances of gene-gene interactions turned out to be significant compared to the control group.

The posteriors of the number of sub-populations, some of which are shown in Figure 7.2, give high probabilities to 5, the true number of sub-populations.

7.1.5. **Detection of DPL** The correct positions of the DPL, provided by GENS2, are $rs13266634$ and $rs7903146$, for the first and second gene respectively. Due to the LD effects implied by the highly correlated structure of our current HDP based model, the actual DPL are difficult to locate. Notably, our model is considerably more structured than those of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), and any inappropriate dependence structure would render the task of DPL finding far more difficult than our previous models. Nevertheless, we demonstrate that our HDP model can detect DPLs with more precision compared to our previous matrix-normal-inverse-Wishart model for gene-environment interactions.

Following Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), and writing $\boldsymbol{p}^r_{ijk} = \{p_{mijkr} : m = 1, \ldots, M\}$, we declare the r-th locus of the j-th gene as disease pre-disposing if, for the r-th locus, the Euclidean distance $d^r_j\left(\text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_0jk=0}\right), \text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_1jk=1}\right)\right)$, between logit $\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_0jk=0}\right)$ and logit $\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_1jk=1}\right)$, is significantly larger than $d^{r'}_j\left(\boldsymbol{p}^{r'}_{i_0jk=0}, \boldsymbol{p}^{r'}_{i_1jk=1}\right)$, for $r' \neq r$. We adopt the graphical method as in our previous works. The red, horizontal lines in the panels of Figure 7.3 represent the cut-off value such that the points above the horizontal line are those with the highest 2% Euclidean distances. The actual DPLs of the two genes, as well as their nearest neighbours with Euclidean distances on or above the red, horizontal lines, are shown in the figures. That even such small sets of SNPs with highest 2% Euclidean distances consist of close neighbours of the true DPLs, is quite encouraging. Observe that the DPL detection is more precise for the second gene in the sense that the closest neighbour of the actual DPL above the red,



(a) Posterior probability of no gene-gene interactions in control subjects.



(b) Posterior probability of no genetic effect with respect to cases.

Figure 7.1: **Presence of gene-gene and gene-environment interaction:** Index plots of the posterior probabilities of no gene-gene interactions in (a) controls and (b) cases, with respect to the two genes.



(a) Posterior of τ_{110}.



(b) Posterior of τ_{211}.



(c) Posterior of τ_{120}.



(d) Posterior of τ_{221}.

Figure 7.2: **Gene-gene and gene-environment interaction:** Posterior distributions of the number of sub-populations.



(a) Index plot for the first gene

(b) Index plot for the second gene.

Figure 7.3: **Presence of gene-gene and gene-environment interaction:** Plots of the Euclidean distances $\left\{d_j^r\left(\text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_0jk=0}\right), \text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}^r_{i_1jk=1}\right)\right);\ r=1,\ldots,L_j\right\}$ against the indices of the loci, for $j=1$ (panel (a)) and $j=2$ (panel (b)).

horizontal line is closer to the true DPL than for the first gene.

The above results on DPL detection is also a significant improvement over Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) where highest 10% Euclidean distances were considered, suggesting that our current HDP based model is more appropriate compared to our previous matrix-normal-inverse-Wishart model for gene-environment interaction.

7.2 **Second simulation study: no genetic or environmental effect**

Here we use the same case-control genotype data set as used by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) in their second simulation study where genetic effects are absent, consisting of 49 cases and 51 controls and 5 sub-populations with the mixing proportions $(0.1, 0.4, 0.2, 0.15, 0.15)$. We use the same environmental data set generated in our first simulation study described in Section 7.1, which is unrelated to this genotype data.

Here we obtain $P\left(d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.407$. Although this does not cross the 0.5 benchmark, there is significant evidence in favour of the null, and falling short of 0.5 can be attributed to the slight deficiency of the distance between the two approximate central clusterings associated with case and control, as already discussed in the context of the first simulation study.

Also, in this study, $P\left(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}\right)$, $P\left(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}\right)$ and $P\left(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}\right)$ are given by 0.549, 0.550 and 0.649, respectively, suggesting insignificance of the effect of the environmental variable on gene-gene interaction. As noted in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), however, it is not straightforward to test whether or not the environment is responsible for the case-control status. This is because we have modeled the genotype data conditionally on case-control instead of modeling the case-control status conditionally on the environmental variable. Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) use significance testing in a simple logistic regression framework to show insignificance of the environmental variable.

As before, our model assigned high posterior probability to 5 sub-populations.

Note that since there is no genetic effect in this study, the question of detecting DPLs does not arise here.

7.3 Third simulation study: absence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but presence of environmental effect

In this study we consider a case-control genotype data set simulated from GENS2 where case-control status depends only upon the environmental data. The number of cases here is 47 and the number of controls is 53. This is the same case-control genotype data set as used by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) in their third simulation study.

In this case, we find that $P\left(d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.400$, which provides reasonable evidence in favour of the null, even though the 0.5 benchmark is not crossed. Moreover, $P\left(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.536$, $P\left(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.518$ and $P\left(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.504$, suggesting that the environmental variable does not affect the genetic structure. Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) show by means of Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), in the context of simple logistic regression, that the best model consists of the marginal effects of the second gene and the environment. In conjunction with our HDP-based model which produces reasonable evidence in favour of accepting the hypothesis of no genetic effect, it may be possible to conclude that the environmental variable is responsible for the case-control status.

As before, 5 subpopulations get significant weight by our posterior distribution, and again, the question of DPL detection is irrelevant here since there is no genetic effect.

7.4 Fourth simulation study: presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect

Here we use the same genotype data set as used by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) in their first simulation study associated with genetic and gene-gene interaction effects, consisting of 41 cases and 59 controls and 5 sub-populations with the mixing proportions $(0.1, 0.4, 0.2, 0.15, 0.15)$. We use the same environmental data set generated in our first simulation study described in Section 7.1, which is unrelated to this case-control genotype data.

Here we obtain $P\left(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.549$, $P\left(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.542$ and $P\left(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.552$, correctly suggesting insignificance of the environmental variable with respect to its effect on the genetic structure. Using logistic regression, Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) conclude

that the environmental variable has no role to play in the case-control status. Furthermore, we obtain $P\left(d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.390$, $P\left(\hat{d}_1 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_1}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.336$ $P\left(\hat{d}_2 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_2}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.324$. so that importance of genes is correctly indicated by our tests. Figure 7.4 shows the posterior probabilities of no gene-gene interactions for controls and cases. Interestingly, there seems to be no gene-gene interaction in the control group and only two (marginal) instances of gene-gene interaction among the cases.

Figure 7.5 shows the plots of Euclidean distances between cases and controls for the loci of the two genes. In this case, Gene-1 has been located quite precisely, and for Gene-2 the Euclidean distance for even the true DPL is very close to the red, horizontal line, indicating encouraging performance.

7.5 **Fifth simulation study: independent and additive genetic and environmental effects**

As in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), we consider the situation where the genetic and environmental effects are independent of each other and additive; the data consists of 57 cases and 43 controls.

Note that, as in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), in our current HDP-based Bayesian model also there is no provision for additivity of genetic and environmental effects. As such, it is not expected to capture the true data-generating mechanism accurately. Indeed, here we obtain $P\left(d^* < \varepsilon_{d^*}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.389$, $P\left(\hat{d}_1 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_1}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.337$ and $P\left(\hat{d}_2 < \varepsilon_{\hat{d}_2}|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.331$, indicating significance of the genes. However, the test with d_E^* does not yield overwhelming evidence against the null. Our tests of gene-gene interaction, as depicted in Figure 7.6, indicate significant interactions for controls and particularly for cases. Also, $P\left(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}\right)$, $P\left(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}\right)$ and $P\left(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}\right)$ are given, approximately, by 0.547, 0.550 and 0.367, the last value showing that the environmental variable does affect gene-gene interaction. The lack of the additivity provision in our model seems to have forced the gene-environment interaction in this case.

In spite of the lack of additivity of our model the Euclidean distances between cases and controls for the gene-wise SNPs are not adversely affected, and the actual DPLs are detected quite



(a) Posterior probability of no gene-gene interactions in control subjects.



(b) Posterior probability of no genetic effect with respect to cases.

Figure 7.4: **Presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect:** Index plots of the posterior probabilities of no gene-gene interactions in (a) controls and (b) cases, with respect to the two genes.



(a) Index plot for the first gene

(b) Index plot for the second gene.

Figure 7.5: **Presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect:** Plots of the Euclidean distances $\left\{d_j^r\left(\text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{i_0jk=0}^r\right), \text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{i_1jk=1}^r\right)\right);\ r=1,\ldots,L_j\right\}$ against the indices of the loci, for $j=1$ (panel (a)) and $j=2$ (panel (b)).



(a) Posterior probability of no gene-gene interactions in control subjects.



(b) Posterior probability of no genetic effect with respect to cases.

Figure 7.6: **Presence of genetic and gene-gene interaction effects but absence of environmental effect:** Index plots of the posterior probabilities of no gene-gene interactions in (a) controls and (b) cases, with respect to the two genes.



(a) Index plot for the first gene

(b) Index plot for the second gene.

Figure 7.7: **Independent and additive genetic and environmental effects:** Plots of the Euclidean distances $\left\{d_j^r\left(\text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{i_0jk=0}^r\right), \text{logit}\left(\boldsymbol{p}_{i_1jk=1}^r\right)\right);\ r=1,\ldots,L_j\right\}$ against the indices of the loci, for $j=1$ (panel (a)) and $j=2$ (panel (b)).

accurately; see Figure 7.7. This brings forth the generality and usefulness of our nonparametric dependence structure. As before, 5 sub-populations receive significant posterior probabilities.

8. APPLICATION OF OUR HDP BASED IDEAS TO A REAL, CASE-CONTROL DATASET ON MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

We now consider application of our model and methods to a case-control dataset on early-onset of myocardial infarction (MI) from MI Gen study, obtained from the dbGaP database **http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gap**. The same dataset has been analyzed by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) without considering the sex variable as the covariate, and by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), who incorporate the sex variable in their gene-environment interaction model. Although Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) obtained significant genetic and gene-gene interaction effects, their later study after considering sex as the environmental variable, revealed strong effects of the sex variable but no significant gene-gene interaction, although many of the

genes turned out to be individually significant. In our current HDP based analysis, we once again obtain strong effects of the sex variable, but in contrast with Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), although we obtain significant genetic effects, none of the genes turned out to be significant individually. Moreover, the subject-wise gene-gene interactions, although of small magnitude, turned out to be significant in some cases, and interestingly (and apparently counter-intuitively) seem to be instrumental in counter-acting the disease rather than provoking it.

8.1 **Data description**

We recall that the MI Gen data obtained from dbGaP consists of observations on presence/absence of minor alleles at 727478 SNP markers associated with 22 autosomes and the sex chromosomes of 2967 cases of early-onset myocardial infarction, 3075 age and sex matched controls. The average age at the time of MI was 41 years among the male cases and 47 years among the female cases. The data broadly represents a mixture of four sub-populations: Caucasian, Han Chinese, Japanese and Yoruban. Using the Ensembl human genome database (**http://www.ensembl.org/**) we could categorize 446765 markers out of 727478 with respect to 37233 genes.

As in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) we considered 32 genes covering 1251 loci, for 200 individuals. These SNPs include those that are believed to be associated with MI and also those that are believed to be associated with different cardiovascular end points like LDL cholesterol, smoking, blood pressure, body mass, etc. See Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) for the details and the relevant references.

Since the four broad sub-populations are not unlikely to admit further genetic sub-divisions, it makes sense to set the maximum number of mixture components, M, to a value much larger than 4. As before, we set $M = 30$; we also set $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1$, so that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}$ is the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. As in the simulation experiments, here also the structures $\alpha_{G,ik} = 0.1 \times \exp(100 + \mu_G + \beta_G E_{ik})$, $\alpha_{G_0,k} = 0.1 \times \exp\left(100 + \mu_{G_0} + \beta_{G_0} \bar{E}_k\right)$ and $\alpha_H = 0.1 \times \exp\left(100 + \mu_H + \beta_H \bar{\bar{E}}\right)$, where $\mu_G, \mu_{G_0}, \mu_H \overset{iid}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ and $\beta_G, \beta_{G_0}, \beta_H \overset{iid}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$, ensured adequate number of sub-populations and satisfactory mixing of MCMC. For the null data and model, we follow the same procedure as discussed in Section 6.2.4.

8.2 Remarks on model implementation

Our parallel MCMC algorithm detailed in Section 5 takes about 7 days to generate 30,000 iterations on our VMware. We discard the first $10,000$ iterations as burn-in, using the subsequent 20,000 iterations for our Bayesian inference. Satisfactory mixing properties are indicated by informal convergence diagnostics such as trace plots.

8.3 Results of the real data analysis

8.3.1. **Effect of the sex variable** We obtain $P(|\beta_G| < \varepsilon_{\beta_G}|\text{Data}) \approx 0$, $P(|\beta_{G_0}| < \varepsilon_{\beta_{G_0}}|\text{Data}) \approx 0$ and $P(|\beta_H| < \varepsilon_{\beta_H}|\text{Data}) \approx 1$. In other words, although $\bar{\bar{E}}$ (here E being the sex variable) is insignificant, both E_{ik} and $\bar{E}_k$ are very significant. Thus, in this study, sex plays an important role in influencing the genes.

8.3.2. **Roles of individual genes** With the clustering metric we obtained $P\left(d^* < \epsilon_1|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.030$ while that with the Euclidean distance we obtained $P\left(d_E^* < \epsilon_2|\text{Data}\right) \approx 0.540$. That is, the maximum of the gene-wise clustering metrics turns out to be significant, while the maximum of the gene-wise Euclidean metrics is seen to be insignificant. The same ambiguity was also obtained by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). The tests of the marginal genes are expected to shed some light regarding this dilemma. The posterior probabilities of the null hypotheses (of no significant genetic influence) are shown in Figure 8.1. As is observed, none of the individual genes turned out to be significant, for either the clustering metric or the Euclidean metric. Our result is not much different from that of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) who also note that their marginal probabilities, at least for the clustering metric, are not sufficiently small to provide strong enough evidences against the nulls.

Now, at least from the clustering metric perspective, it is necessary to explain the issue that all the genes are insignificant individually but still the maximum of the gene-wise clustering metrics is significant. The key to this issue seem to be the correlations between the distances, which are induced by gene-gene interactions. We explain this phenomenon using a bivariate normal example. Let (X_1, X_2) have a bivariate normal distribution with means 0, variances 1, and correlation ρ.



(a) Posterior probability of no genetic effect with respect to clustering metric.



(b) Posterior probability of no genetic effect with respect to Euclidean metric.

Figure 8.1: **Posterior probabilities of no individual genetic influence:** Index plots of the posterior probabilities of the null hypotheses for (a) clustering metric and (b) Euclidean metric, for the 32 genes.



Figure 8.2: **Bivariate normal example:** Plot of the median of $\max\{X_1, X_2\}$ with respect to the correlation ρ.

Figure 8.2 depicts the median of $\max\{X_1, X_2\}$ as a function of ρ, which is seen to be increasing as ρ decreases from 1 to -1. On the other hand, the medians of the marginal distributions of X_1 and X_2 remain zero, irrespective of the value of ρ. Thus, it seems that gene-gene interaction does have some role to play in this study.

8.3.3. **Gene-gene interactions** Unlike Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), where there is a single gene-gene correlation structure for all the individuals, our current model has provision for subject-specific gene-gene correlations. Figures 8.3 and 8.4 show the gene-gene correlations of some males (3 cases, 1 control) and some females (1 case, two controls), respectively. Essentially, the pictures represent the distinct gene-gene correlation patterns for all the male cases, all the male controls, all the female cases, and all the female controls.

Although the correlations are small in all the cases, the tests of hypotheses reveal some interesting structures, depicted in Figures 8.5 and 8.6. Panel (a) of Figure 8.5 show that none of the genes of the concerned male case interact with each other. In fact, there are at 9 male cases where no gene-gene interaction is significant. Panel (b) shows that two genes, namely, $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$, interact with all the genes, for another male case. Panel (c) shows the results of significance tests of gene-gene interactions for another male case. Here, only $AP006216.10$ inter-

acts with all the genes. For the male controls, a typical example of which is shown in panel (d), mostly only $C6orf106$ or only $AP006216.10$ interacts with every gene, but in a few cases both $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$ interact with all the genes.

Even for the females, the two genes, $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$, are responsible for gene-gene interactions. Indeed, in our data, unlike in the case of 9 males, there is no female for whom all gene-gene interactions are insignificant. The relevant representative plots for the females, given by Figure 8.6, shows that for all the female cases, only $AP006216.10$ interacts with every gene, and for female controls, either only $AP006216.10$ or only $C6orf106$ interacts with every gene, or both $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$ interact with all the genes.

The messages gained from our analysis seem to be somewhat counter-intuitive but perhaps quite insightful. Our tests indicate that the individual genes are not responsible for the case-control status. Thus, MI seems to be caused by some external, non-genetic factors. But for most of the subjects, at least one of the genes $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$ interact with every other gene. Any subject, for whom none of the genes interacted, turned out to be a male case. Since MI does not seem to be caused by genetic effects, it seems that all the subjects were already exposed to the risk of the disease, but lack of any genetic interaction in these males failed to get them any preventive measure against MI. On the other hand, the interactions of the genes $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$ with all the genes seemed to reduce the risk of the disease for the other subjects. Thus, in this study, the gene-gene interactions seem to have a beneficial effect on the subjects. It also seems that only a small proportion of males are prone to the risk of having no beneficial gene-gene interactions.

Note that our results are broadly consistent with those obtained by Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) but are more precise and informative. Indeed, they also noted relatively small impact of the individual genes and small gene-gene correlations. Our current ideas and analyses also support their conclusion that external factors (in particular, sex) are perhaps playing a bigger role in explaining case-control with respect to MI. We recall (see Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*)) that with respect to the data that we used, the empirical conditional probability of a male given case is about 0.38, and that of a male given control is about 0.50, so that females seem to



(a) Male case.

(b) Male case.



(c) Male case.



(d) Male control.

Figure 8.3: **Median gene-gene posterior correlation plot for some male cases and a male control.**



(a) Female case.

(b) Female control.



(c) Female control.



(d) Female control.

Figure 8.4: **Median gene-gene posterior correlation plot for a female case and some female controls.**



(a) Male case.

(b) Male case.



(c) Male case.



(d) Male control.

Figure 8.5: **Median gene-gene posterior correlation plot for some male cases and a male control.**



(a) Female case.

(b) Female control.



(c) Female control.

(d) Female control.

Figure 8.6: **Median gene-gene posterior correlation plot for a female case and some female controls.**

be more at risk, given our data. The inherent coherence of the Bayesian paradigm upholds the sex factor by attaching little importance to the individual genes. However, in contrast with Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) who found no interacting genes, here it turns out that the genes $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$ generally interact with every gene to lower the risk factor of the individuals exposed to the causes of MI. Importantly, a few males are the ones who do not have such interactions, and each one of them turned out to be the case. This seems to be roughly in accordance with the popular belief that males are more susceptible to MI than females. Our Bayesian model coherently weaves together the prior and the data and brings out this information in spite of the data-driven information that females are more prone to MI than males. We also note that Lucas, Lluis-Ganella, Subirana, Masameh & Gonzalez (2012), who analyzed the same MI dataset using logistic regression, reached the conclusion that there is no significant gene-gene interaction. Thus, their result completely supports that of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) and are also very much in keeping with our current results.

8.3.4. **Posteriors of the number of sub-populations** Figures 8.7 and 8.8 show the posteriors of the number of sub-populations for the same males and females associated with Figures 8.5 and 8.5, respectively. Observe that the posteriors are quite similar, with the mode at 3 and 4 components receiving the next highest probability. Thus, the 4 sub-populations, irrespective of sex, are well-supported by our model, showing that these can not be further sub-divided genetically. This is not unexpected, since the roles of the individual genes are not significant in our study. Our result broadly agrees with Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) who obtained for different genes, the modes at 5 components, with 4 components receiving the next highest posterior mass.

9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed a novel Bayesian nonparametric gene-gene and gene-environment interaction model based on hierarchies of Dirichlet processes. This model is a significant improvement over that of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) in the sense of much clear interpretability and accounting for subject-specific gene-gene interactions. Moreover, the interactions arise as nat-



(a) Male case.



(b) Male case.



(c) Male case.



(d) Male control.

Figure 8.7: **Posteriors of the number of components for some males.**



(a) Female case.

(b) Female control.

(c) Female control.

(d) Female control.

Figure 8.8: **Posteriors of the number of components for some females.**

ural by-products of our nonparametric structure based on HDP, and are not based on matrix normal distributions, as in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*a*) and Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*), and hence, are more realistic. We propose a novel parallel MCMC algorithm to implement our model, that combines powerful technology with conditionally independent structures inherent within our HDP based model and efficient TMCMC methods. The Bayesian tests of hypotheses that we employ in this paper are are appropriately modified versions of those proposed in Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*).

Applications of our ideas to biologically realistic datasets generated under 5 different setups characterized by different combinations and structures associated with gene-gene and gene-environment interactions demonstrated encouraging performance of our model and methods. Our analysis of the MI dataset showed strong impact of the sex variable, which is consistent with the results of Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*). Our tests showed no effect of the individual genes, which is also in keeping with Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) who obtained relatively weak marginal effects. But most interestingly, even though we obtained very weak gene-gene correlations in accordance with Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya (2016*b*) and Lucas et al. (2012), our tests on gene-gene interaction showed that two genes, $AP006216.10$ and $C6orf106$, generally interact with all the other genes in a beneficial way so as to fight the disease. Moreover, in the only situations where all the gene-gene interactions turned out to be insignificant, were male cases, showing that the usual belief that males are more prone to heart attack than females may hold some value from this perspective.

So far, due to insufficient computational resources, we are compelled to restrict focus on a relatively small portion of the data. However, we are striving to significantly improve our computational infrastructure in order to be able to analyze the entire MI data set.

REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, D., & Bhattacharya, S. (2016*a*), "A Bayesian Semiparametric Approach to Learning About Gene-Gene Interactions in Case-Control Studies,". Available at "http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.7571".

Bhattacharya, D., & Bhattacharya, S. (2016*b*), "Effects of Gene-Environment and Gene-Gene Interactions in Case-Control Studies: A Novel Bayesian Semiparametric Approach,". Available at "https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.03519".

Dey, K. K., & Bhattacharya, S. (2016), "On Geometric Ergodicity of Additive and Multiplicative Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo in High Dimensions," *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, . Available at "http://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.0915.pdf".

Hunter, D. J. (2005), "Gene Environment I nteractions in Human Diseases," *Nature Publishing Group*, 6, 287–298.

Lucas, G., Lluis-Ganella, C., Subirana, I., Masameh, M. D., & Gonzalez, J. R. (2012), "Hypothesis-Based Analysis of Gene-Gene Interaction and Risk of Myocardial Infraction," *Plos One*, 7, 1–8.

Majumdar, A., Bhattacharya, S., Basu, A., & Ghosh, S. (2013), "A Novel Bayesian Semiparametric Algorithm for Inferring Population Structure and Adjusting for Case-control Association Tests," *Biometrics*, 69, 164–173.

Mather, K., & Caligary, P. (1976), "Genotype x Environmental Interactions," *Heredity*, 36, 41–48.

Mukhopadhyay, S., & Bhattacharya, S. (2013), "Bayesian MISE Convergence Rates of Mixture Models Based on th Polya Urn Model: Asymptotic Comparisons and Choice of Prior Parameters,". Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.5508.

Mukhopadhyay, S., Bhattacharya, S., & Dihidar, K. (2011), "On Bayesian "Central Clustering": Application to Landscape Classification of Western Ghats," *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5, 1948–1977.

Mukhopadhyay, S., Roy, S., & Bhattacharya, S. (2012), "Fast and Efficient Bayesian Semiparametric Curve-fitting and Clustering in Massive Data," *Sankhya. Series B*, 71, 77–106.

Papaspiliopoulos, O., & Roberts, G. O. (2008), "Retrospective Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods for Dirichlet Processes Hierarchical Models," *Biometrika*, 95, 169–186.

Pinelli, M., Scala, G., Amato, R., Cocozza, S., & Miele, G. (2012), "Simulating Gene-Gene and Gene-Environment Interactions in Complex Diseases: Gene-Environment iNteraction Simulator 2," *BMC Bioinformatics*, 13(132).

Sethuraman, J. (1994), "A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors," *Statistica Sinica*, 4, 639–650.

Teh, Y. W., Jordan, M. I., Beal, M. J., & Blei, D. M. (2006), "Hierarchical Dirichlet Processes," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 1566–1581.